A major purpose of the Technical Information Center is to provide the broadest dissemination possible of information contained in DOE's Research and Development Reports to business, industry, the academic community, and federal, state and local governments.

Although a small portion of this report is not reproducible, it is being made available to expedite the availability of information on the research discussed herein.

1

LA-UR -87-310

C N? S7//)-- I*

LA-UR--87-310

DE87 006071

TITLE: PRESSURE DEPENDENCE OF THE SPECIFIC HEAT OF HEAVY-FERMION COMPOUNDS

AUTHOR(S): N. E. Phillips, R. A. Fisher, S. E. Lacy, C. Marcenat,
J. A. Olsen; Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Berkeley, CA
J. Flouquet, CRTBT/CNRS, Grenoble, France
A. Amato, D. Jaccard; Univ. of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland
Z. Fisk, P-10; A. L. Giorgi, MST-5; J. L. Smith, CMS
G. R. Stewart, University of Florida, Gainsville, FL

DISCLAIMER

Los Alamos
Los Alamos National Laboratory
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

MASTER

DISTRIBU

PRESSURE DEPENDENCE OF THE SPECIFIC HEAT OF HEAVY-FERMION COMPOUNDS

N. E. Phillips[1], R. A. Fisher[1], S. E. Lacy[1], C. Marcenat[1],
J. A. Olsen[1], J. Flouquet[2], A. Amato[3], D. Jaccard[3],
Z. Fisk[4], A. L. Giorgi[4], J. L. Smith[4] and G. R. Stewart[4,5]

[1]MMRD, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, University of California,
Berkeley, CA 94720 USA
[2]CRTBT/CNRS, BP166X, 38042 Grenoble Cedex, France
[3]Physics Department, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerl: 1
[4]MST, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545 USA
[5]Present address: Physics Department, University of Florida,
Gainsville, FL 32611 USA

Measurement of the properties of materials as a function of pressure (P)
provides an additional dimension for comparison with models and theoretical
calculations. It also provides a relatively sound basis for establishing
correlations between different properties. For example, if one looks for
correlations between superconductivity and magnetic properties by studying
series of different compounds or alloys, one is forced to resort to compari-
sons that are complicated, to a very substantial degree, by chemical and
structural differences. If instead one studies the pressure dependence of
the properties of a single material, only one relatively simple parameter,
the volume (V), is changed. Measurement of the pressure dependence of the
properties of heavy-fermion compounds (HFC) is particularly fruitful because
the 4f and 5f electrons, which play the central role in the phenomenon, are
extremely sensitive to pressure, and large effects are observed at modest
pressures. Although the electrical resistivity (ρ) and the magnetic
susceptibility (χ) of a number of HFC have been measured as a function of
pressure, it is only recently that data for the specific heat (C) have become
available for non-zero pressure. We describe here measurements of C(P) to
$P \sim 9$ kbar for $CeAl_3$ [1], $CeCu_6$ [2], $^{11}Be_{13}$ [3], and UPt_3 [4]. Independent
measurements of C(P) to $P \sim 6$ kbar have been reported for $CeCu_2Si_2$ [5].

All HFC have high values of C/T for T<10K, but the details of the temper-
ature dependence of C/T vary significantly. Figure 1 shows the qualitative-
ly different types of behavior that have been observed at zero pressure for
the normal state of HFC that do not order magnetically. Also represented for
comparison are data for α-Ce, for which γ, the value of C/T at T=0, is "high"
(0.012 J/mole K^2) relative to those for ordinary metals. $CeAl_3$ is the proto-
typical example of an HFC that does not undergo a transition to an ordered
state -- neither superconductivity nor magnetic ordering are observed above
20mK [6]. Above 0.5K its properties, including the specific heat, are
similar to those of a dilute (single-ion) Kondo system. Near 0.5K there is
a conspicuous maximum in C/T, and in the low-temperature limit, C/T = 1.20 +
1.96T J/mole K^2 [1]. The maximum in C/T has been associated with the devel-
opment of coherence in a Kondo lattice [7]. There may also be a maximum in
C/T for $CeCu_2Si_2$ but in that case the analysis of the experimental data is
complicated by occurrence of superconductivity, by a strong field dependence

of the normal state specific heat, and by sample-to-sample variations in the properties [7,8].

Another HFC that shows neither superconductivity nor magnetic ordering to the lowest temperatures of investigation is $CeCu_6$. In that case, the low-temperature limiting behavior is $C/T = 1.67 - 0.67T$ J/mole K^2, and there is no maximum in C/T above 60 mK [9]. (A maximum in C/T near 0.3K has been reported [10], but its existence is also inconsistent with other data [11]). With respect to the absence of a maximum in C/T, both UBe_{13} [12] and $CeRu_2Si_2$ [11,13] seem to be similar to $CeCu_6$, and this may be the more usual behavior for the normal state of an HFC that does not order magnetically.

UBe_{13} undergoes a transition to the superconducting state near 0.9K, but the curve in Fig. 1 represents the normal-state specific heat (C_n). The dashed part of the curve is an extrapolation of C_n data to T=0, $C_n = 1.31T - 1.58T^2 + 1.44T^3$ J/mole K, that is consistent with the temperature dependence of C_n between 0.5 and 1K, and also with the entropy calculated from data for the superconducting-state specific heat (C_s), which extend to lower temperatures [12]. Other similar results have also been reported [14,15]. The possibility of a maximum in C_n/T is not ruled out, but it seems unlikely.

As Fig. 1 makes clear, the specific heat of UPt_3 shows still another qualitatively different type of behavior. There is a shallow minimum in C_n/T in the vicinity of 10K. At lower temperatures there is an increase in C_n/T (which is barely perceptible in Fig. 1) and a gradual approach to a constant value in the T=0 limit. In the low temperature region, $C/T = \gamma + \delta T^2 \ln T + \epsilon T^2$ [16,17,4]. A C/T of that form was originally predicted for ferromagnetic spin fluctuations [18,19]. It is now believed to arise more generally within Fermi-liquid theory, but there are only a very few systems in which it has been observed experimentally. UPt_3 is unique among HFC, unique among superconductors of all kinds, and very unusual among metals in general in exhibiting a specific heat of this form. It is now fairly generally believed that there are two characteristic energy scales, and two corresponding temperature scales that are important in understanding HFC behavior. One temperature scale, represented by T_K, is determined by the Kondo-like interactions of the 4f and 5f electrons with the conduction band; the other, corresponding to an energy that is one to two orders of magnitude smaller, and represented by T^*,


Fig. 1. The specific heats of four HFC, and for comparison that of α-Ce, as C/T vs. log T. For UPt_3 and UBe_{13}, it is C_n that is represented.

Fig. 2. Pressure dependence of C/T for CeAl$_3$.

is determined by the interactions between the f electrons, and is related to
the development of coherence for the Kondo lattice. The transition from one
regime to the other is marked, for example, by a maximum in ρ, which occurs
at a temperature T_M. For most HFC T_M is of the order of a few tens of K
or less, but for UPt$_3$ it is above room temperature [20]. Thus, it seems
probable that the difference between UPt$_3$ and the other HFC for which C/T
is displayed in Fig. 1 reflects differences in the values of T* and T_K, and
the fact that, in contrast with the others, data for UPt$_3$ are well within the
region in which C/T is dominated by the intersite interactions. From this
point of view, it seems possible that the $T^3\ln T$ terms observed in UPt$_3$ exist
in the other HFC as well, but would be observed only at temperatures below

**Fig. 3.** Pressure dependence of C/T for CeCu$_6$.

Fig. 4. Pressure dependence of C/T for UBe_{13}.

those to which measurements have been made to date.

The experimental data for C(P) for $CeAl_3$, $CeCu_6$, UBe_{13} and UPt_3 are shown in Figs. 2-5, respectively. To show more clearly the relations between the data at different pressures in the 2-20K region, smoothed representations of $[C(P)-C(0)]/T$ are plotted in Figs. 6-9. The error bars represent the indicated percentage of the total measured heat capacity (i.e., including that of the pressure cell). In most cases the precision of the measurements is such that the uncertainty in the heat capacity of the sample is of the order of C 1% of the total. For $CeAl_3$ the uncertainty is about 0.5% and above 15K, not much more than the sign of $(\partial C/\partial P)_T$ is determined. For discussion of the pressure or volume dependence of a property X, it is convenient to introduce the Gruneisen parameter defined as $\Gamma_X \equiv -(\partial \ln X/\partial \ln V)_T$


Fig. 5. Pressure dependence of C/T for UPt_3.

Fig. 6. Pressure dependence of $[C(P)-C(0)]/T$ for CeAl$_3$.

$= \kappa^{-1}(\partial \ln X/\partial P)_T$ where κ is the compressibility. Smoothed values of Γ_C are given in Tables 1-4.

As noted above, the temperature dependence of the specific heat of UPt$_3$ is qualitatively different from those of CeAl$_3$, CeCu$_6$ and UBe$_{13}$. Figs. 2-5 and particularly Figs. 6-9 show that the pressure dependences are also very different. For CeAl$_3$, CeCu$_6$ and UBe$_{13}$, there is a low temperature region in which $(\partial C/\partial P)_T$ is predominantly negative, an intermediate temperature region in which it is positive, and a higher temperature region in which it is negative again. The changes in sign depend on pressure as well as temperature, but they occur, very approximately, at 3 and 17K for CeAl$_3$, at 2 and 10K for CeCu$_6$, and at 3 and 10K for UBe$_{13}$. For UPt$_3$, in contrast, $(\partial C/\partial P)_T$ is negative, except for P ~ 4-9 kbar and T ~ 12K where it is approximately zero. This difference between UPt$_3$ and the others is probably also asso-


Fig. 7. Pressure dependence of $[C(P)-C(0)]/T$ for CeCu$_6$.

Fig. 8. Pressure dependence of [C(P)-C(0)]/T for UBe$_{13}$.

ciated with a difference in relative importance of the interactions repre-
sented by T^* and T_K in the temperature region of the measurements. There
is substantial non-linearity in the pressure dependence of C for all four
materials, but it is particularly extreme for CeAl$_3$ for which $[C/T]_{0.4K}=1.79$
- 0.85 $P^{1/6}$ (P in kbar and C in J/mole K^2) for the non-zero pressures at
which C was measured [1]. (There must be deviations from that relation near
zero pressure [1].) The deviations from linearity are apparent in Figs. 2-9
and Tables 1-4.

The pressure dependence of C is related to the temperature dependence of
the thermal expansion (α) by the thermodynamic expression $(\partial\alpha'\partial T)_P =$
$-(VT)^{-1}(\partial C/\partial P)_T$. Experimental values of α are available for both CeAl$_3$ [6,25]
and UPt$_3$ [26], at zero pressure, and can be compared with $(\partial C/\partial P)_T$ in the

Fig. 9. Pressure dependence of (C(P)-C(0)]/T for UPt$_3$.

Table 1. Γ_C for $CeAl_3$ (hexagonal), based on $\kappa = 2.16 \times 10^{-3}$ $kbar^{-1}$ [21].

P(kbar) \ T(K)	0	0.4	1	2	4	10	15	20
0.2	-160	-710	-340	-80	70	100	110	80
1	-52	-51	-37	-14	6	17	0	-5
2	-50	-48	-40	-19	-2	6	-5	-14
4	-41	-40	-38	-24	-6	4	0	-3
6	-27	-27	-26	-21	-8	1	0	-3
8	-15	-15	-14	-13	-9	0	0	-3

Table 2. Γ_C for $CeCu_6$ (which undergoes a change in crystal structure from orthorhombic to monoclinic near 200K), based on $\kappa = 1.1 \times 10^{-3}$ $kbar^{-1}$ [22].

P(kbar) \ T(K)	0	0.5	1	1.5	2	5	10	20
0	-115	-52	0	20	40	-8	-56	-90
1	-88	-54	-19	0	10	4	-28	-72
3	-73	-60	-41	-23	-13	14	-4	-54
5	-68	-60	-46	-31	-18	12	6	-37
7	-66	-57	-48	-35	-20	5	12	-17
9	-63	-55	-50	-38	-22	0	18	0

Table 3. Γ_C for UBe_{13} (cubic), based on $\kappa = 0.97 \times 10^{-3}$ $kbar^{-1}$ [23].

P(kbar) \ T(K)	1	2	5	10	15	20
0	-63	11	56	-41	-125	-230
1	-50	0	40	-26	-88	-190
3	-32	-10	-27	-2	-36	-65
5	-30	-14	-23	10	-18	-60
7	-33	-17	21	16	-19	-55
9	-34	-18	18	18	-20	-60

Table 4. Γ_C for UPt_3 (hexagonal), based on $\kappa = 0.48 \times 10^{-3}$ $kbar^{-1}$ [24].

P(kbar) \ T(K)	0[a]	1	2	5	10	15	20
0	-59	-62	-64	-69	-75	-82	-140
1	-58	-58	-57	-54	-49	-73	-127
3	-56	-53	-48	-40	-24	-46	-95
5	-56	-53	-47	-36	-9	-14	-58
7	-57	-55	-50	-36	-2	-3	-32
9	-58	-57	-55	-36	0	0	-19

[a] Values of Γ_C at T=0 are from extrapolated C_n.

same limit. For CeAl₃, the measured values of α are in reasonable agreement
with $(\partial C/\partial P)_T$ above 1K, but there is a conspicuous discrepancy at lower temp-
eratures where $(\partial \alpha/\partial T)_P$ becomes negative (again) but there is no indication
of the corresponding change to positive values of $(\partial C/\partial P)_T$. The resolution
of the discrepancy may lie in a further change in sign of $(\partial C/\partial P)_T$, either at
lower temperatures or at lower, but still non-zero, pressures than
those at which C has been measured [1]. For UPt₃, the C and α data are
consistent to within the probable experimental errors [4,27,28].

The C(P) data can be compared with ρ(P) by use of the empirical rule
that γ is approximately proportional to T_M^{-1} [29]. For CeAl₃, T_M (16 kbar)/
$T_M(0)$ = 2 [6] and, by extrapolation, $\gamma(0)/\gamma$(16 kbar) = 2.3 [1]. For CeCu₆
$\gamma(0)/\gamma$(9 kbar) = 2.0 [2] and T_M(9 kbar)/$T_M(0)$ = 2.2 [30]. For UBe₁₃ the com-
parison is less clear both because measurements under pressure and in mag-
netic field, necessary to determine $C_n(P)$, have not been made, and because of
the uncertainty in the extrapolation of C_n/T to T=0. Nevertheless, at least
the qualitative applicability of the correlation is obvious: T_M(9 kbar)/
$T_M(0)$ = 1.8 [31]; $[C_n(0)/C_n$(9 kbar)$]_{1K}$ ~ 1.5 and, if one makes a rough ex-
trapolation of C_n(9 kbar)/T to T=0 from T>1K and accepts the value of γ(0)
reported above, $\gamma(0)/\gamma$(9 kbar) = 2.0 [3]. Presumably both T_M and γ depend in
a complicated way on the interplay between the interactions related to T* and
T_K, and the correlation between γ and T_M^{-1} seems to point to the existence
of some kind of scaling relation that involves both of these characteristic
temperatures.

From the pressure dependence of the $T^3\ln T$ and T^3 terms in the specific
heat of UPt₃, one can derive the pressure dependence of the associated
characteristic temperature. Application of expressions derived for spin
fluctuations [18,19] gives a spin fluctuation temperature (T_{sf}) and a Fermi
temperature (T_F) that vary from T_{sf} = 6.4K and T_F = 154K at P=0 to T_{sf} =
88.1K and T_F = 196K at 8.9 kbar [4]. That analysis suggests that the pressure
dependence of the band structure is more important than that of the Stoner
enhancement in determining the macroscopic properties. Another interpretation
of the same data within the framework of Fermi-liquid theory has led to
similar conclusions [27]. The data have also been compared with the pressure
dependence of ρ and χ to demonstrate consistency with a Kondo lattice model,
rather than ferromagnetic spin fluctuations [32].

Fig. 10. Magnetic field dependence of C/T for polycrystalline CeAl₃.

Fig. 11. Magnetic field dependence of C/T for single crystal $CeCu_6$.

The pressure dependence of C has also been measured for $CeCu_2Si_2$ [5] and $\Gamma_\gamma \sim -70$, similar to the values for the two U-based superconductors, $\Gamma_\gamma \sim -60$ for UBe_{13} and $\Gamma_\gamma = -57$ for UPt_3. One might think of looking for correlations between Γ_γ and Γ_{Tc} (where Tc is the critical temperature for superconductivity) and a comparison with BCS superconductors for clues to the origin of superconductivity. Such a comparison has been made for UPt_3 [4] on the basis of spin fluctuation theory, but there is increasing evidence that that theory is not applicable. The values of Γ_{Tc} for the three heavy-fermion superconductors are not very similar: $\Gamma_{Tc} \sim 7$ for $CeCu_2Si_2$ [5], ~ -76 for UPt_3 [4] and ~ -48 for UBe_{13} [3].

There are interesting qualitative similarities between the effects of magnetic field (H) and P on C for both $CeAl_3$ and $CeCu_6$. The effect of H on C/T is shown in Figs. 10 and 11 for $CeAl_3$ [33] and $CeCu_6$ [9], for comparison with the P dependences shown in Figs. 2 and 3. Near 0.4K a pressure of 8 kbar reduces C/T for $CeAl_3$ by 70%, while a field of 8T produces a 33% reduction. Below 0.4K C/T increases with H [7], but at low pressure there is also some reason to expect an increase in C/T in this region (see above). For $CeCu_6$ near 0.3K and 9 kbar, C/T is reduced by 50%, while 7.5T along the [001] axis causes a reduction of 60% (~30% if the reduction is averaged over all three axes). These similarities suggest a similar role of H and P in suppressing the effects of intersite interactions (T*), which probably dominate C in the low temperature region. By contrast with the non-magnetic, non-superconducting Ce-based HFC, both UBe_{13} and UPt_3 exhibit only a weak dependence of C/T on H at any temperature -- $\sim -2\%$ for UBe_{13} at 1K and 7.5T and $\sim +2\%$ for UPt_3 between 0 and 4K at 8T.

REFERENCES

1. G. E. Brodale, R. A. Fisher, N. E. Phillips and J. Flouquet, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56: 390 (1985).
2. R. A. Fisher, S. E. Lacy, C. Marcenat, N. E. Phillips, J. Flouquet, A. Amato and D. Jaccard, to be published.
3. J. A. Olsen, R. A. Fisher, N. E. Phillips, Z. Fisk, A. L. Giorgi, J. L. Smith and G. R. Stewart, to be published.
4. G. E. Brodale, R. A. Fisher, N. E. Phillips, G. R. Stewart and A. L. Giorgi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57: 234 (1986).
5. A. Bleckwedel and A. Eichler, Solid State Commun. 56: 693 (1985).
6. K. Andres, J. E. Graebner and H. R. Ott, Phys. Rev. 35: 1779 (1975).
7. C. D. Bredl, S. Horn, F. Steglich, B. Luthi and R. M. Martin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 52: 1982 (1984).
8. C. D. Bredl, H. Spille, U. Rauchschwalbe, W. Lieke, F. Steglich, G. Cordier, A. Assmus, M. Herrmann and J. Aarts, J. Magn. Magn. Mat. 31-34: 373 (1983).
9. A. Amato, D. Jaccard, J. Flouquet, F. Lapierre, J. L. Tholence, R. A. Fisher, S. E. Lacy, J. A. Olsen and N. E. Phillips, to be published.
10. K. Satoh, F. Fujita, Y. Maeno, Y. Onuki and T. Komatsubara, Solid State Commun. 56: 327 (1985).
11. F. Steglich, U. Rauchschwalbe, U. Gottwick, H. M. Mayer, G. Spain, N. Grewe, U. Poppe and J. J. M. Franse, J. Appl. Phys. 57: 3054 (1985).
12. R. A. Fisher, S. E. Lacy, C. Marcenat, J. A. Olsen, N. E. Phillips, Z. Fisk, A. L. Giorgi, J. L. Smith and G. R. Stewart, this conference.
13. M. J. Besnus, J. P. Kappler, P. Lehmann and A. Meyer, Solid State Commun. 55: 779 (1985).
14. H. R. Ott, H. Rudigier, Z. Fisk and J. L. Smith, Phys. Rev. Lett. 50: 1595 (1983). H. R. Ott, H. Rudigier, Z. Fisk and J. L. Smith, "Moment Formation in Solids", ed. W. J. L. Buyers (Plenum, NY) p. 305 (1984).
15. F. Steglich, "Theory of Heavy Fermions and Valence Fluctuations", ed. T. Kasuya and T. Saso, Springer Series in Solid State Sciences 62:23 (1985).
16. G. R. Stewart, Z. Fisk, J. O. Willis and J. L. Smith, Phys. Rev. Lett. 52: 679 (1984).
17. A. de Visser, J. J. M. Franse, A. Menovsky and T. M. Palstra, J. Phys. F14: L191 (1984).
18. S. Doniach and S. Engelsberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 17: 750 (1966).
19. W. F. Brinkman and S. Engelsberg, Phys. Rev. 169: 417 (1968).
20. M. S. Wire, J. D. Thompson and A. Fisk, Phys. Rev. B30: 5591 (1984).
21. M. Niksch, B. Luthi and K. Andres, Phys. Rev. B22: 5774 (1980).
22. A. Shibota, G. Oomi, Y. Onuki and T. Komatsubara, J. Phys. Soc. (Japan) 55: 2086 (1986).
23. R. A. Robinson, J. D. Axe, A. I. Goldman, Z. Fisk, J. L. Smith and H. R. Ott, Phys. Rev. B33: 6488 (1986). (κ calculated from elastic constants.)
24. A. de Visser, J. J. M. Franse and A. Menovsky, to be published.
25. M. Ribault, A. Benoit, J. Flouquet and J. Palleau, J. Phys. (Paris) 40: L413 (1979).
26. A. de Visser, J. J. M. Franse and A. Menovsky, J. Phys. F: Met. Phys. 15: L53 (1985).
27. C. J. Pethick, D. Pines, K. F. Qader, K. S. Bedell and G. E. Brown, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57: 1955 (1986).
28. A. de Visser, A. Menovsky and J. J. M. Franse, to be published.
29. B. Bellarbi, A. Benoit, D. Jaccard, J. M. Mignot and H. F. Braun, Phys. Rev. B30: 1102 (1984).
30. J. D. Thompson and Z. Fisk, Phys. Rev. B31: 389 (1985).
31. H. R. Ott, H. Rudigier, Z. Fisk and J. L. Smith, Phys. Rev. Lett. 50: 1595 (1983).
32. A. Auerbach and K. Levin, to be published.
33. G. E. Brodale, R. A. Fisher, N. E. Phillips, C. M. Lisse and A. S. Edelstein, Solid State Commun. 56, 271 (1985).